



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1459
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,560	09/17/2003	Howard Thomas Deason	9364	4599
27752 7590 03/04/2009 THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY Global Legal Department - IP Sycamore Building - 4th Floor 299 East Sixth Street CINCINNATI, OH 45202				
EXAMINER				
GRAY, JILL M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/04/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/664,560

Applicant(s)

DEASON ET AL.

Examiner

Jill Gray

Art Unit

1794

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 10-12, 14 and 15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 10-12, 14 and 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1-2, 10-12, and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartbauer et al., 3,960,272 and 3,912,571 (Hartbauer), for reasons of record.

Hartbauer teaches a rolled multi-ply product of the type contemplated by applicants, comprising a rolled multi-ply fibrous structure having a core end and a tail which is bound to another portion of the multi-ply product by an adhesive, wherein the tail of the multi-ply fibrous structure comprises a consumer accessible tab, as required by claim 1. See Figures 11-15. In addition, Hartbauer teaches that the multi-ply fibrous structure is freely convolutedly wound from the core end out to the tail end to form a rolled multi-ply product, the tail is sealed to the fibrous structure with at least a portion of the consumer accessible tab more proximal to the tail end than the adhesive, using an adhesive and that said tab comprises at least two plies bonded together, as required by claims 2 and 14. As to the consumer accessible tab exhibiting a greater bond strength than the ply bond strength throughout the remainder of the multi-ply fibrous structure, it is the position of the examiner that this requirement would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to reduce unraveling of the product by inadvertently pulling the tab during handling such as removing the product from commercial packaging and to provide sufficient pull strength

when accessing the tab for consumer use. Regarding claims 10-11, the consumer accessible tab of Hartbauer extends from about the tail end of the fibrous structure along the fibrous structure towards the core end of the multi-ply fibrous structure. Regarding claim 12, Hartbauer specifically teaches that his fibrous structure can be a multi-ply fibrous structure. Accordingly, the examiner has reason to believe that the at least two plies of the multi-ply fibrous structure are bonded together by mechanical and/or chemical and/or electrostatic forces in the absence of factual evidence to the contrary. Applicants are invited to provide such evidence. As to claim 15, Hartbauer teaches that the multi-ply fibrous structure can be a sanitary tissue product. See '272 column 12, line 50 and '571, column 12, and line 52.

Accordingly the teaching of Hartbauer would have rendered obvious the invention as claimed in present claims 1-2, 10-12 and 14-15.

3. Claims 1-2, 10-12, and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartbauer et al., 3,960,272 and 3,912,571 (Hartbauer) as applied above, and further in view of Von Paleske 6,924,042 B2, for reasons of record.

Hartbauer is as set forth above and teaches a rolled multi-ply fibrous product of the type contemplated by applicants. Von Paleske teaches that it is known in the art to form multi-ply products wherein at least two of the plies are bonded together. See abstract and column 2, lines 25-63. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art, at the time the invention was made to use as the multi-ply fibrous product of Hartbauer, a multi-ply fibrous product of the type taught by Von

Paleske and as known in this art, namely, a multi-ply fibrous product wherein the first ply and second ply are bonded together.

Therefore, the combine teachings of Hartbauer and Von Paleske would have rendered obvious the invention as claimed in present claims 1-2, 10-12, and 14-15.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed December 11, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants have submitted Exhibit 1 and argue that Hartbauer fails to teach that its consumer accessible tab is more proximal to the tail end than the adhesive and thus claim 1 as amended is not rendered obvious over Hartbauer, and dependent claims 2, 10-12, and 14-15 which depend from claim 1 are not rendered obvious over Hartbauer. Applicants additionally argue that Von Paleske fails to teach each and every element of claim 1 as amended for the same reasons that Hartbauer alone fails to teach each and every element of claim 1 as amended.

In this regard, it is the examiner's position that the location of the adhesive such that the consumer accessible tab is more proximal to the tail end than the adhesive constitutes no more than a shifting of the adhesive to a slightly different location which does not modify the operation of the consumer accessible tab or rolled multi-ply product. Nor is it clear on this record of superior or unexpected properties in the resultant multi-ply product wherein said properties are directly related to this shift of location of the adhesive. In the instant case, it is the position of the examiner that this

in-line shift in location of the adhesive is not a matter of invention and can be subject to general operating conditions in manufacture.

No claims are allowed.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jill Gray whose telephone number is 571-272-1524. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and alternate Fridays 8:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith Hendricks can be reached on 571-272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jill Gray/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1794

JMG